There is a taint worse than all taints—ignorance is the worst taint.
—*The Dhammapada*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 53 FEBRUARY, 1965 NUMBER 4

REFLECTIONS ON THE FUTURE

IT is only a few short years to the two hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American republic. As time goes, two centuries is the briefest of interludes in universal history, yet the changes since 1776, in all the world as well as in the United States, are so far-reaching that an American of the colonial days would be likely to find the present quite unimaginable.

He would move from a continent almost untouched by human beings to a land that is entirely occupied, widely exploited, and in some instances in danger of being used up. He would find the natural resources of his country harnessed and made available far beyond the dreams of any utopian romance. The progress in inventions and technology would pass his comprehension. And quite other longings than those familiar to him would shape human hopes for the future.

One is drawn to wonder how a Thomas Paine would speak to the present; how the high principles of his social and moral vision would be applied to the dilemmas which bewilder the minds of so many of the well-intentioned men of today.

Fortunate the patriot, easy his task, when public problems and difficulties can be brought into focus in some external source!

What, indeed, is the true heritage that the people of the United States have had from their Founding Fathers?

It was not simply the plan, but the actual creation, of a society which has the principle of self-determination for the basis of a com-

mon life. This was the gift of the eighteenth century to posterity—the evolution and actualization of a scheme of human relationships which rested upon no external authority, but upon the participants themselves. This achievement was indeed worthy to inaugurate a "new order of ages."

What the Theosophical student may reflect upon, in connection with this historical development, is its effect upon the operation of karmic law. Where there is moral as well as practical responsibility *from within,* the Karma that flows from what is done will also be an internally pervasive influence. It will be felt in psychological terms, and the psycho-social processes which have come into being by self-determining decisions.

A karmic harvest of this sort presents new difficulties to a people whose traditional way of solving problems has been to look for an external cause, or an outside enemy. There is a sense in which this kind of social evolution parallels the growth in religious philosophy to a point where people no longer look to an outside God for help, or blame their troubles upon an outside source of evil. This, in terms of manasic evolution, represents that maturity which belongs to the cycle of further intellectual and moral awakening. Accordingly, a similar challenge lies in the many faceted social problems of the age; there is the need to see how attitudes fall short of the fulfillment of individual responsibility, and to recognize the effects of this failure when projected on the scale of a population of hundreds of millions.

It is to be noted that H.P.B., who wrote for the twentieth century, and not for the eighteenth, anticipated this need quite specifically in the section "What Is Practical Theosophy?" in the *Key*:

> *Enquirer*: Do you take any part in politics?
>
> *Theosophist*: As a Society, we carefully avoid them, for the reasons given below. To seek to achieve political reforms before we have effected a reform in *human nature, is like putting new wine into old bottles.* Make men feel and recognize in their innermost hearts what is their real, true duty to all men, and every old abuse of power, every iniquitous law in the national policy, based upon human, social or political selfishness, will disappear of itself. . . . No lasting political reform can be ever achieved with the same selfish men at the head of affairs as of old.

On the question of social efforts, she said:

> Now, true evolution teaches us that by altering the surroundings of the organism we can alter and improve the organism; and

> in the strictest sense this is true with regard to man. Every Theosophist, therefore, is bound to do his utmost to help on, by all the means in his power, every wise and well-considered effort which has for its object the amelioration of the condition of the poor. Such efforts should be made with a view to their ultimate social emancipation, or the development of the sense of duty in those who now so often neglect it in nearly every relation of life.

There can be no question as to where the emphasis, in this cycle, must lie. While supporting beneficent external change, as will all those who would put an end to unnecessary suffering and want, H.P.B. showed that the long-term objective lies in awakening a sense of duty. Asked how desirable social efforts might be selected, she pointed out the difficulty in laying down any rule, then added:

> One general test may, however, be given. Will the proposed action tend to promote that true brotherhood which it is the aim of Theosophy to bring about? No real Theosophist will have much difficulty in applying such a test; once he is satisfied of this, his duty will lie in the direction of forming public opinion. And this can be attained only by inculcating those higher and nobler conceptions of public and private duties which lie at the root of all spiritual and material improvement. In every conceivable case he himself must be a center of spiritual action, and from him and his own daily individual life must radiate those higher spiritual forces which alone can regenerate his fellowmen.

This is an analysis of social service which is founded on evolutionary law. It takes account of the kind of understanding that will be increasingly necessary in the future, as dilemmas multiply and as available scapegoats diminish. The social thinkers of the future may not use the vocabulary of H.P.B.; their approach may incorporate more of the language of social and psychological science since her day; but the principles she announced will surely be present, if any of the changes undertaken can be expected to *work*.

It may fall to Theosophists, in the years to come, to help devise practical applications of those principles. Much thoughtful observation, and a wise intelligence, will be needed to avoid the traps and follies of politics, to help to bring into being forms of action which truly afford means of self-regeneration, and at the same time enlist the cooperation and arouse the enthusiasm of those who want to help but have not yet seen how to begin.

HERETICS AND THE RENAISSANCE

[The implication of the title of *The Secret Doctrine* is twofold. First, no teaching or belief, however exalted, can convey truth directly to the inner consciousness of man; the essence of a true "doctrine" is discovered only when it serves as a catalytic agent within the egoic processes of the individual—a "secret," until then, to be inwardly revealed.

The relationship of theosophical concepts to history, whether they are doctrinal or philosophical, can therefore be seen to parallel the primary psychological facts of "soul learning." In any age, when a doctrine is taken to be a truth, and when fanaticism compels lip service to exclusive group beliefs, the ideas of Theosophy seem buried and forgotten. We discover, however, that this is never entirely the case. The insistences of dogma and prejudice are like the snows which hide the promise of spring. But seeds survive beneath the snow and, even during the darkest centuries of Western history, there was heat and warmth enough under the surface to allow some of these seeds to germinate. In a sense, then, the history of the relationship between "heretics" and the "renaissance" is the history of every age.

Of the ten articles comprising the series, "Heretics and the Renaissance," the first seven are derived entirely from recognized historical sources; the remaining three consist solely of quotations from the writings of H. P. Blavatsky, making, in effect, a review *in the light of Theosophy* of the main ideas dealt with earlier. The theosophical student who has assembled this material has done what H.P.B. spoke of doing in her Introduction to *The Secret Doctrine*—put together "a nosegay of culled flowers," adding only "the string that ties them." While the scholars whose works are drawn upon may not have had before them the full perspective of the Theosophical Movement, its "story" is nonetheless implicit, and by skillful collation is made to appear between the lines. Editors, THEOSOPHY]

I—CHRISTIANITY AND HERESY

THERE cannot be heresy where there is no orthodoxy and, therefore, in the definition it is assumed that the church has declared what is the truth or error in any matter. ("Heresy": *Britannica,* 11th Ed.) Orthodoxy is the doctrine maintained by the infallible Roman Church and assented to by all its faithful mem-

---

NOTE.—*Heretic*: from the Greek hairetikós—able to choose. (Webster's *New International.*)

bers; heresy is dissent from the articles of faith established by the Roman pontiffs and by the councils of the Roman Church. (*Ibid.*, 9.) According to the Canon Law, which was the ecclesiastical law of medieval Europe, and is still the law of the Roman Catholic Church, heresy was defined as error which is voluntarily held in contradiction to the doctrine which has been clearly stated in the creed, and has become part of the defined faith of the church, and which is persisted in by a member of the church. It was regarded not only as an error, but also as a crime to be detected and punished. (*Ibid.*, 11.)

The first employment of the word in the New Testament is to denote a sect or a school of opinion among the Jews. We read of the heresy of the Sadducees (Acts v. 17), the heresy of the Pharisees (Acts xv. 5). Christianity itself was in the beginning looked upon as one of those sects or schools of Jewish opinion, and the "heresy" of the Nazarenes (Acts xxiv. 5) is spoken of.

Three types of heresy have appeared in the history of the Christian Church. The earliest may be called *syncretic;* it is the fusion of Jewish or pagan with Christian elements. During its early years it was primarily Paganism and Judaism which attempted to interpenetrate Christianity. (*Ibid.*, 9.) The Church first started to grow on Jewish and pagan soil, being composed originally of followers of either Judaism or Paganism. Many of these converts conceived the idea of strengthening the new creed, and of enriching its simple doctrine with Jewish and pagan wisdom; thus strengthened it would be able to wage the fight with greater glory and success. These efforts gave birth successively to the Jewish and gnostic heresies, and while the Church was weakened on the inside through heresies which were the result of some harmoniously blended elements being emphasized either too much or too little, those heresies on the outside now entwined its trunk like parasites, trying to suffocate it. The Kabalah was held in high esteem particularly by the Essenes, and even more so by the mystic Therapeutae among the Hellenizing Jews in Egypt, and its influence is clearly discernible in the writings of their close friend Philo. The Jewish Christians, who had joined Christianity from that side, were above all anxious to claim for it a not too unfavorable position with regard to Judaism. The pagan Christians in their turn showed an even greater eagerness to use their rich store for coming to the aid of the harassed Church. (Görres, pp. 26-32.)

Among the Jewish converts the main element was opposition to the Christian doctrine of the real divinity of Christ, God who has become man. They preferred to regard the Saviour as the last of the prophets, one who bore the same relation to God and to man as the prophets did. On the other hand, the idea that runs through all Greek philosophy, that matter is the source of evil, induced many of the early gentile converts to Christianity to think of the incarnation as a metaphor rather than as a fact. Christ, they thought, did not take, but only seemed to take a human body. These Docetists, as they were called, had a wide series of successors in the early church. (*Brit.,* 9.)

The Gnostics in all their various sects distinguished between God and the Creator. The good God, they held, could not defile Himself by contact with Matter, and therefore could not be the God of creation and providence. The judaizing and the paganizing tendency were combined in Gnostic Ebionitism which was prepared for in Jewish Essenism. In the later heresy of Manichaeism there were affinities to Gnosticism, but it was a mixture of many elements, Babylonian-Chaldaic theosophy, Persian dualism and even Buddhist ethics. (*Brit.,* 11.)

The dualistic system appeared very clearly among the Sethites and Cainites. According to the Ophites the Sophia descending to Hyle had given birth to Ilda-Baoth, the evil son of Chaos, who with six stellar spirits created by him had called forth the world and finally also man, and ensouling him by his breath with the higher light of which he was possessed, forbade him to eat of the fruit of the tree, in order to withhold from him his higher knowledge. Thus the serpent spirit, also created by him, who seduced man to commit the transgression, became his benefactor. As all these heresies, almost without exception, had thus adopted the doctrine of the duality of the principles, they finally all became absorbed in Manichaeism. (Görres, pp. 26-32.)

The next type of heresy may be called *evolutionary* or *formatory.* When the Christian faith is being formulated, undue emphasis may be put on one aspect, and thus so partial a statement of truth may result in error. It is not necessary in illustration of the second type of heresy—that which arises when the contents of the Christian faith are being defined—to refer to the doctrinal controversies of the middle ages. (*Brit.,* 11.)

The third type of heresy is the *revolutionary* or *reformatory,* often

referred to as *anti-ecclesiastical* or *anti-sacerdotal* heresy. This is not directed against the doctrine as such, but against the church, its theory and its practice, against the errors and abuses of ecclesiastical authority. On the one hand there were during the middle ages sects, like the Cathari and Albigenses, whose opposition as a rule developed itself from dualistic or pantheistic premises (surviving effects of old Gnostic or Manichaen views) and who stood outside of ordinary Christendom, and while no doubt affecting many individual members within it, had apparently no influence on church doctrine. On the other hand there were movements, such as the Waldensian, the Wycliffite and Hussite, which are often described as "reformations anticipating the Reformation" which set out from the Augustinian conception of the Church, but took exception to the development of the conception and were pronounced by the medieval church as heretical. The Reformation itself was from the standpoint of the Roman Catholic Church heresy and schism. (*Ibid.*)

As long as the Christian Church was itself persecuted by the pagan empire, it advocated freedom of conscience, and insisted that religion could be promoted only by instruction and persuasion (Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Lactantius); but almost immediately after Christianity was adopted as the religion of the Roman empire the persecution of men for religious opinions began. While Constantine at the beginning of his reign declared complete religious liberty, and kept on the whole to this declaration, yet he confined his favors to the orthodox hierarchical church, and even by an edict of the year 326 formally asserted the exclusion from these of heretics and schismatics. Theodosius the Great, in 380, soon after his baptism, issued, with his co-emperors, the following edict (*Ibid.*):

> We, the three emperors, will that our subjects steadfastly adhere to the religion which was taught by St. Peter to the Romans, which has been faithfully preserved by tradition, and which is now professed by the pontiff Damasus of Rome, and Peter, bishop of Alexandria, a man of apostolic holiness. According to the institution of the Apostles, and the doctrine of the Gospel, let us believe in the one Godhead of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, of equal majesty in the Holy Trinity. We order that the adherents of this faith be called *Catholic Christians;* we brand all the senseless followers of the other religions with the infamous name of *heretics,* and forbid their conventicles assuming the name of churches. Beside the condemnation of divine justice, they must expect the heavy penalties which our authority, guided by heavenly wisdom, shall think proper to inflict. (Schaff's *Ni-*

cene and Post-Nicene Christianity. I, 142.)

Civil punishment followed religious offences as early as the time of Constantine, who enacted severe penalties against the Donaits, and ordained that all possessing Arian books should burn them on the pain of death (Arianism, from Arius, Christian priest at Alexandria, died A.D. 336, who held that Christ the Son was not consubstantial with God the Father). Arcadius made the reading of books written by the Eunomians a capital crime. Theodosius and Valentinian proscribed Nestorian books, and Valentinian and Marcian the books of Eutyches and Nestorius. The custom became so common that the condemnation of any heresy by the church was followed by the proscription of the writings of members of the sect. The *Codex Theodosianus,* bk. xvi. tit. 5, "De haereticis," enumerates a great variety of laws against heresy with penalties more or less severe, including the death penalty. (*Brit.,* 9.)

During the Middle Ages, especially from the time of Innocent III onward, civil interference in case of heresy was much increased. In the early church the power of discipline belonged to the presbytery, and was afterwards usurped by the bishops, who continued to exercise it in matters of heresy until Innocent III appointed the Inquisition to deal with heretics. So long as the empire was not Christian, the civil law had nothing to do with the punishment of erroneous opinions, but as soon as Christianity became the authorized religion of the state, the old pagan idea that the state has the power to punish *religiones novas et illicitas* was reviewed. The state, either instructed by the church or, as in Theodosian code, without instruction, visited with civil pains and penalties all such opinions. This came to a height when the Inquisition was established, and civil courts and national assemblies one after another decreed that whatever penalties were imposed by the Inquisition should be imposed by the state, or else handed over all cases of heresy to the Inquisition to be dealt with deserving the infliction of civil penalties, fines, imprisonment, torture and death. There is no sadder page in the history of the church than her alliance with the state for the purpose of torturing men out of opinions different from her own. (*Ibid.*)

The triumph of intolerance was inevitable when Christianity became the religion of the state, yet the slowness of its progress shows the difficulty of overcoming the incongruity between persecution and the gospel. Hardly had orthodoxy been defined by the Council of Nicea, which was held in the year 325, when Constantine brought

the power of the State to bear to enforce uniformity. All heretic and schismatic priests were deprived of the privileges and immunities bestowed on the clergy and were subjected to the burdens of the State; their meeting places were confiscated for the benefit of the church, and their assemblies, whether public or private, were prohibited. (Lea I, 212.)

Step by step the inevitable progress was made, and men easily found specious arguments to justify the indulgence of their passions. The fiery Jerome, when his wrath was excited by Vigilantius forbidding the adoration of relics, expressed his wonder that the bishop of the hardy heretic had not destroyed him in the flesh for the benefit of his soul, and argued that piety and zeal for God could not be cruelty; rigor, in fact, he argues in another place, is the most genuine mercy, since temporal punishment may avert eternal perdition. It was only sixty-two years after the slaughter of Priscillian and his followers had excited so much horror, that Leo I, when the heresy seemed reviving, in 447, not only justified the act, but declared that if the followers of heresy so damnable were allowed to live, there would be an end of human and divine law. The final step had been taken, and the church was definitely pledged to the suppression of heresy at whatever cost. It is impossible not to attribute to ecclesiastical influence the successive edicts by which, from the time of Theodosius the Great, persistence in heresy was punished with death. (Lea I, 214-15.)

A powerful impulse to this development is to be found in the responsibility which grew upon the church from its connection with the State. When it could influence the monarch and procure from him edicts condemning heretics to exile, deportation, to the mines, and even to death, it felt that God had put into his hands powers to be exercised and not to be neglected. At the same time, with natural human inconsistency, it could argue that it was not responsible for the execution of the laws, and that its own hands were unstained with blood. It became the general doctrine that princes are bound not only to be orthodox themselves, but preserve the purity of the faith by the fullest exercise of their power against heretics. To prevent or to punish evil was not persecution, but love. How abundantly these assiduous teachings bore their bitter fruit is shown in the deplorable history of the church during those centuries, consisting as it does of heresy after heresy relentlessly exterminated, until the Council of Constantinople, under the Patriarch Michael Oxista, introduced

the penalty of burning alive as the punishment of the Bogomili. (Lea I, 216.)

* * *

Sources used in this installment: *Encyclopædia Britannica,* Ninth and Eleventh editions under "Heresy"; J. v. Görres, *Die Christliche Mystik Regensburg* (Verlag von G. Joseph Manz, 1840) Vol. III, pp. 26-32; Henry Charles Lea, *A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages* (Harper, N. Y., 1888), Vol. I, pp. 212, 214-6.

(*To be continued*)

ON LANGUAGE

Language, theosophically considered, is clearly both individual and potentially universal. Among American Indians, the differences between the languages of the Caddo and the Kiowa are greater than the differences between Chinese and English; one is amazed at the diversity and intricate development of speech and language found among primitive peoples; we learn of the yearnings of separated groups for their mother tongue, while other ethnic classes fear for the loss and purity of their original tongue.

It is not alone the "mystic language of the secret books" that may first intrigue the student, but the realization that in remote antiquity, "the whole human race was at that time of one language and of one lip." This fact H.P.B. discourses upon frequently, noting that the "cyclic evolution" of language involves *"fall into matter"* and "admixture with other languages," thereby experiencing "maturity, decay and finally death." This alone can explain the mystifying and fragmentary puzzles that confront linguistic researchers.

Language—as a fascinating field of exploration—is at once a revealing picture of the spiritual growth of man philosophically and a science of manifold ramifications. And this latter fact is as well known to students of the ancient Wisdom Religion as it is to those concerned with investigations of anthropology and related subjects.

H. P. Blavatsky, foremost in extolling the virtues of "the Hindu Aryan—the most metaphysical and spiritual people on earth"—often speaks of the glories of the ancients, as when, in her *Secret Doctrine,* she upholds "the primitive, purely spiritual language of the Vedas." For, as she declares, "with the ancient Aryans the hidden meaning was grandiose, sublime, and poetical, however much the external appearance of their symbol may *now* militate against the claim."

—A STUDENT'S NOTES

ANOTHER DIMENSION

IN studying paintings done by young children one becomes aware of the frequency with which a third dimension is lacking. The pictures may be alive with color and show freedom of movement in line, but they appear as existing on a plane rather than as having depth. The resulting impression may be one of unreality, if not lifelessness. However, the viewer need not be disturbed by this reaction, because he can make a mental adjustment and supply this dimension of depth. The mind instinctively recognizes that our world is a three-dimensional one and if the artist has not indicated this fact, then allowances must be made for his interpretation.

It is interesting that one lacking the power of sight makes a similar mental adjustment in the sense world which he knows, the world of hearing. One who is perceptive can judge the shape of an object, or at least its distance, by an apparently instinctive calculation based on sound waves as they are reflected back to the hearer.

We think of this dimension of depth as the one which gives substance or reality to an object, no matter what the mode of perception. This can be applied also to philosophy. Often the student of Theosophy is initially in the position of the child painter. The fascination of Theosophical literature can be as absorbing as the preoccupation of the young artist with color. The new student, enamored of this vast array of knowledge, all his for the effort of study, becomes engrossed in this pursuit. But the theosophic *life* demands another dimension, a depth which is vital, and that is the dimension of application. The theory may, indeed, be true, and beautiful in its simplicity of expression. The philosophy may, by the introduction of the paradoxical, arouse the intellect. It may, by emphasis on principle, point to a consistency throughout the manifold circumstances of life. But without the practical application of this wisdom we have a philosophy divorced from reality, an intellectual exercise only. As application is made one becomes truly aware of the reality of the teaching; the richness which can be added to the most humble life is indeed dependent on the vitality of Theosophy as a moving force, as an actuality far beyond the printed word or the mental concept, as fact and not theory.

"THE REVOLUTION OF THE AGE"

REVOLUTION in some form is constantly in process: it is the pattern of Life—cyclic motion, continuity, the ceaseless tide of Being. Time, place, and circumstance identify or qualify any phase of revolutionary movement but are not the cause of it. The period of "time" may be a moment or an æon; the "place," physical or metaphysical; the "circumstance," or essential condition accompanying the moving manifestation, may be obvious or deeply occult; but all these are incident to, not causative of, the movement. The essence of revolution, *progressive motion*—symbolized perhaps by the turning of a globe upon its axis—has its cause in the realm of ideas. Some degree of Intelligence is at the root of every movement, and, as Plato said, "Ideas rule the world." This is *logos* in action.

Revolution in the truly evolutionary sense devolves from and is dependent upon the presence of Great Beings *among men.* This sublime idea the teachers of Theosophy present as the basis for the Brotherhood of humanity.

> The most intelligent being in the universe, man, has never been without a friend, but has a line of elder brothers who continually watch over the progress of the less progressed, preserve the knowledge gained through æons of trial and experience, and continually seek for opportunities of drawing the developing intelligence of the race on this or other globes to consider the great truths concerning the destiny of the soul. These elder brothers also keep the knowledge they have gained of the laws of nature in all departments, and are ready when cyclic law permits to use it for the benefit of mankind. They have always existed as a body, all knowing each other, no matter in what part of the world they may be, and all working for the race in many different ways. In some periods they are well known to the people and move among ordinary men whenever the social organization, the virtue, and the development of the nations permit it. For if they were to come out openly and be heard of everywhere, they would be worshipped as gods by some and hunted as devils by others. In those periods when they do come out some of their number are rulers of men, some teachers, a few great philosoph-

> ers, while others remain still unknown except to the most advanced of the body. (*Ocean of Theosophy,* p. 3.)

The greatest barrier to knowledge of this beneficent influence lies in man's preoccupation with himself as a physical and personal being, as separate from all others. Fame, fortune, possessions, the desire to dominate, and the yielding to domination, to some degree strengthen the false notion of separateness and perpetuate the ignorance from which it springs. As a psychic and intellectual being, man is interrelated with all others—with the whole of Life. In his highest Being—as Spirit, as the Perceiver, the Self, the Knower—he is One, identical in essence with all beings of every grade of intelligence, whose manifestation depends on interdependence. This brotherhood-in-fact is realizable through dwelling upon the *Ideal* of brotherhood.

In this larger view of Brotherhood, evolution begins with the ONE, the radical Unity of all, and ONE-ness or Individuality is the natural goal. The means to reach that goal "varies with the Pilgrim," yet the twofold approach is the same for all: (*a*) inward search or examination of motive—"the unexamined life is not worth living" (Socrates); and (*b*) outward search, for the meanings in all that we encounter in daily life—"All that is is a part of life, and when it comes to me it is a part of my life" (Robert Crosbie).

The *Bhagavad-Gita* exemplifies and enhances these ideas and makes of living a noble adventure. It is the story of man's evolutionary journey, says Wm. Q. Judge in his *Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita*: "The very place in the *Mahabharata* in which this episode is inserted has deep significance, and we cannot afford to ignore anything whatever that is connected with the events." What is this "deep significance"?

The "place" is significant if we consider the time and the circumstance, which was the incarnation of a divine Teacher:

> Krishna was an Avatar. According to the Brahmins, we are now in Kali-Yuga, which began about the time of Krishna's appearance. He is said to have descended in order to start among men those moral and philosophical ideas which were necessary to be known during the revolution of the Age, at the end of which —after a brief period of darkness—a better Age will begin. (*Notes on the Bhagavad-Gita,* p. 1.)

Any one great historical epoch will give us a picture of the evolution in man, in the mass, of any "corresponding faculty" of the In-

dividual Soul. In the mass, we are in the 5th Sub-Race of the 5th Root-Race of the 4th Round. The Individual Soul is the reincarnating Ego, Manas, the fifth principle in the constitution of man. Krishna "belongs to the Fifth Race," said H.P.B. in *The Secret Doctrine*.

Manasic incarnation is awakening to a sense of responsibility, and it throws the lower nature into confusion. Arjuna is at a critical stage, a turn of the cycle, a balance point. His complacent reliance on the knowledge and judgment of other men is shaken. The honored code of ethics, long-established by the Vedas and by men, is imperiled. Apprehensive of danger to his false security, he questions—fearfully and obliquely—with mind predisposed to disagree, should the answer mean change of status quo. Heretofore having unquestioningly accepted existing authorities, a sense of guilt accompanies his rising questions, and he hastily justifies the established order. Lacking courage momentarily to take the heroic stand, he asks the Teacher to think for him, to choose for him, to *tell him what to do*.

True knowledge comes slowly and is not easily acquired, so the Teacher comes again and again: "I produce myself among creatures, O son of Bharata, whenever there is a decline of virtue and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world; and thus I incarnate from age to age for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of righteousness." The incarnation of the Teacher—a Mahatmic incarnation—is sensed throughout all Nature and responded to by mankind in aspiration toward the Brotherhood which the Teacher represents, or by a struggle for selfish self-preservation.

The presence of the Teacher mystically helps man *in the mass,* but the *individual soul* must help himself through understanding the "moral and philosophical ideas necessary to be known during the revolution of the Age." Only through self-induced and self-devised efforts will he realize himself as of the same essence as the Teacher and capable of the same Knowledge and vision of the needs of mankind. To walk in the footsteps of the "predecessors" means, ultimately, to take the resolve to *live to benefit mankind.*

The keynote for H.P.B.'s work in our cycle was struck in the Preface to her first book, *Isis Unveiled:* "It is meant to do even justice, and to speak the truth alike without malice or prejudice. But it shows neither mercy for enthroned error, nor reverence for

usurped authority. It demands for a spoliated past, that credit for its achievements which has been too long withheld. It calls for a restitution of borrowed robes, and the vindication of calumniated but glorious reputations. Toward no form of worship, no religious faith, no scientific hypothesis has its criticism been directed in any other spirit. Men and parties, sects and schools are but the mere ephemera of the world's day. TRUTH, high seated upon its rock of adamant, is alone eternal and supreme."

In a brief paragraph in *The Friendly Philosopher* (p. 148), Robert Crosbie presents an epitome of these ideas:

> Yes, it is war; but not against persons. War for the Truth—the eternal ideas, the eternal thought in the Eternal Mind; war against error, cant and hypocrisy. When the Eternal Verities are presented to the world, they are always presented through persons. Some worship or lean on the persons; others curse, defame or belittle them; none of these look at what is brought forward and handed on. So, too, when error is pointed out, it has to be designated and names used to specify; again, the thoughtless see an attack upon persons. In an age of "personality," the ordinary mind cannot see beyond it, unless care is taken on each occasion to explain it. The war is to help "personalities" to become "living souls." It is the *Mahabharata—the Holy War.*

THE INFLUENCE OF TAOISM

All of us have abilities we can make no use of. When we try to employ them, they vanish, so it is better to take them for granted and profit accordingly.

To remain untouched, and to touch nothing, one must at the same time keep constantly in motion. But then the subtleties of nature are infinite precisely because its manifestations are generic.

Meaning and value have nothing to do with each other. Meaning is only the price we put on things. It defines nothing but our own predilections. But value is innate and intrinsic.

—DAVID STACTON: *Segaki*

YOUTH FORUM

The field of "communications" involves a vast network of external media for drawing the peoples of the world closer in regard to factual data and information, but "communication" in a psychological sense covers a broader spectrum. Most important are the projections and receptions of what the psychologists call empathy. Is it possible for the inmost feelings and intuitions to be communicated by one unique individual to another, or is the most that can be hoped for a reflection or approximation of them?

Sometimes it is good to think about impossible or nearly impossible questions, for it often turns out that the more difficult they are, the more existentially important they are as well. And so with this one. Perhaps schematically it is not a hopeless question to approach; but schemes, like the words that express them, exist in the mind primarily, whereas existence simply *is,* and is usually distorted by verbalization. When we say that words fail, the truth is that it is we who fail the words; and yet, in respect to this present question, it seems clear that the failure is a mutual one: words fail because they cannot embody spiritual actualities (perhaps, for that matter, not even physical actualities), and we fail because none or almost none of us has ever experienced the sharpest and deepest communication that is possible between human beings.

With "failure" thus assured, let us begin anyway. Cocteau speaks of a certain tubercular patient of his acquaintance who once remarked about Thomas Mann's *Magic Mountain*: " 'That book can be understood only by those who have had tuberculosis.' But Thomas Mann wrote it without having been tubercular and precisely in order to have tuberculosis understood by those who do not have it." Cocteau further adds, "We are all sick and can read only those books which treat our disease." These words seem quite suggestive, and contain more than just a criticism of our reading habits; for to a great extent we read the way we live. If all we look for in books are characters we can easily "identify" with, it is possible that in real life we may unconsciously look to other people for echoes or

confirmations of ourselves; and if all we love are echoes, then, really, it is just ourselves that we love. Probably this kind of self-centeredness is most easily visible in such mutual admiration societies as teenage gangs, but it seems nonetheless to be an aspect (perhaps hidden) of practically all of us. We are simply reluctant to grant to other people their fair share of individuality. We like them or we dislike them, we help them or we ignore them, depending on whether or not they are "our kind of people." We treat them and our relationships with them as problems to be solved, rather than as the mysteries they really are. And how we dislike to have one of our old friends change his ways or any of the attitudes we have come to associate with him.

At least partly, this distrust of individuality comes from the fact that individuality implies freedom, an absolute freedom which is at the same time an absolute responsibility. Man is free. Theosophy tells us this; and from any "practical" point of view this is its least attractive tenet. Much more agreeable is the counterbalancing theosophical tenet that Life is One; for by stressing primarily the unity of all beings, it may be possible to forget (at least temporarily) that very real and very necessary solitude which is a prerequisite to first-hand spiritual knowledge—and strangely enough, prerequisite, too, to any real communication with others. Unless these two statements —the Oneness of Life and yet the freedom of man—are each given their full weight of significance, it will be difficult to understand Theosophy, and more difficult still to understand and fully communicate with other people. For it is by the heat and friction of this paradox that we live. To take just one example, we know that when we talk with others we are not simply talking to ourselves—there is an individuality there—yet, on the other hand, if there were not a strong bond of common humanity binding us all together, we could not possibly talk with others and make ourselves understood. The same may be said to apply to the writing of poems, or to the different religions. We sense a fineness which is also a kind of foreignness in others. Indeed, there seems to be a certain foreignness to any beauty, and one wonders sometimes whether that which attracts us most to others is a recognition of elements in them which correspond and answer to ourselves, or whether it is a recognition of certain qualities which inspire us to awe because of their very difference to any qualities we can recognize as our own. In this sense every man *is* an island unto himself, inhabited by his own

unique flora and fauna; and any real communication, which means real seeing, must take this uniqueness into account, and above all must respect it.

But how deep can this communication go? Must it not stop at some point, at the walls of some darkened citadel within the other, which houses his immortal and unreachable individuality? Yes, but where one kind of communication (or love) stops, another and higher kind begins. It is a love of the god within that other—love of the pilgrim soul and of his very process of individuation (which is a quite important aspect of evolution). To describe this love would of course be difficult for anyone, perhaps most difficult for one who has experienced it; but it would seem to involve some sense of inner resolution, much like the resolution of a deeply grating paradox; and, too, a flash of realization that even though this soul is in the most heightened sense an individual—and far more individual than the John Doe personality we thought him to be and found so lovable at first—he is also, like ourselves, a part of the great evolving ocean of life—a facet, like ourselves, of the Absolute.

What this finally means, perhaps, is simply what we have been saying all along; only now the meaning of those words may be a little clearer, and the paradox they involve a bit more miraculous than before: man is free; Life is One.

The Endeavor to Aid

Minds are conquered not by arms, but by love and magnanimity. By magnanimity I mean the desire whereby a man endeavors, solely under the dictates of reason, to aid other men and to unite them to himself in friendship.

A man who desires to help others by counsel or deed will refrain from dwelling on men's faults, and will speak sparingly of human weaknesses. But he will speak at large of men's virtue and power, and the means of perfecting them, that thus men may endeavor to live joyously, so far as in them lies, after the commandment of reason.

He who is led by fear, and does good in order to escape evil, is not led by reason. A strong man hates no one, is enraged with no one, and is in no wise proud.

—Baruch de Spinoza

THE THEOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS

VIEWED in the light of the Three Fundamental Propositions of H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine,* the central theme of the *Upanishads* concerns the "acquirement of individuality" by subjective means. The *Prashna Upanishad* contrasts the "outward life" with the "upward life"—the former referring to the necessary descent of higher intelligences to the world of material interaction. This descent is, of course, simply involvement; and for the disciple who discovers the meaning of spiritual descents, "involvement" means, not subjection to matter, but a definition of responsibilities and opportunities during an ensuing cycle of evolution. The poetic description of matter in the *Prashna Upanishad* is "the potency that is in earth."

The upward life is characterized by luminosity, or "radiance"—that light of the soul which is generated by the inner powers.

> According to his thoughts, he enters life. And life joined by the radiance with the Self leads him to a world according to his will.
>
> He who, thus knowing, knows Life, his being fails not, and he becomes immortal.

The *Prashna Upanishad* also returns to the subject of dreams and provides a subtle psychological view of the meaning of dreams and the power of dreaming:

> Master, how many powers sleep in the man? How many wake in him? Who is the bright one that sees dreams? Whose is that bliss? and in whom are all these set firm?
>
> This bright one in dream enjoys greatness. The seen as seen he beholds again. What was heard, as heard he hears again. And what was enjoyed by the other powers, he enjoys again by the other powers. The seen and the unseen, heard and unheard, enjoyed and unenjoyed, real and unreal, he sees it all.

The greatness of the creative imagination, reflected in the power of dreaming, evidently becomes the agency by which the harvest of former experiences is gathered and synthesized. Plato's doctrine

of "reminiscence"—memory of the soul—comes into focus in the upanishadic statement that "he beholds again" and that "what was heard he hears again." It is also possible to establish a correlation with the concluding paragraph of Patanjali's *Yoga Aphorisms,* which reads:

> The reabsorption of the qualities which have consummated the aim of the soul, or the abiding of the soul united with understanding in its own nature, is Isolation.

As William Q. Judge explains in commentary on Patanjali, this "isolation" is not a separation from the stream of life but only a separation from what the *Upanishad* calls the "binding life." To say that when the disciple "is wrapt by the radiance, the bright one no longer sees dreams," is simply to say that the soul is no longer deflected in vision by objects, suffering, and pleasure, and, in Mr. Judge's words, is no longer able to "consciously partake universally of the great life of the universe."

One is, therefore, invited to reflect again upon the statement of H. P. Blavatsky that the adept attains great wisdom through "cultivating" the power of dreaming. But such cultivation has little to do with the dream interpretation of cultural anthropology or psychoanalysis. While the symbols which tell the story of dream may derive from personal experience and cultural heritage, the keystone of "cultivation" is the determination to establish control of dreams by strengthening the power of the dreamer. Meditation and contemplation preceding nightly entrance into the "dream world" serve in this way.

Of course, one may "meditate" almost exclusively upon what he conceives to be *his* problems, his personal destiny, even if he is thoroughly imbued with the doctrine of periodic reincarnations. And following this concentration many ways of escaping the personal labyrinths of experience may come into focus. But when this *Upanishad* speaks of "coming to rest in the higher Self," it implies that the dreaming power rises *above* specific experience. The common meaning of "isolation" is supplanted, as the separation of the higher Self from lower brings an awareness of spiritual identity with all other forms of life:

> Earth and earth-forms; water and water-forms; light and light-forms; air and air-forms; ether and ether-forms; seeing and seen; hearing and heard; smelling and smelled; taste and tasted; touch and touched; voice and spoken; hands and handled; feet

> and moving; mind and minding; knowledge and knowing; personality and personal; imagination and imagining; radiance and enlightening; life and living. For this Self is the seer, toucher, hearer, smeller, taster, thinker, knower, doer, the perceiving spirit. And this is set firm in the supreme, unchanging Self.

Between the higher egoic consciousness and the "earth and earth-forms" is the upanishadic "borderline" of dreams, and it is for this reason that dreams must of necessity have a primarily symbolic orientation. Two short paragraphs of Erich Fromm's *The Forgotten Language* are plainly relevant to "the Theosophy of the *Upanishads*:

> While we are asleep we are not occupied with managing outer reality. We do not perceive it and we do not influence it, nor are we subject to the influences of the outside world on us. From this it follows that the effect of this separation from reality depends on the quality of reality itself. If the influence from the outside world is essentially beneficial, the absence of this influence during sleep would tend to lower the value of our dream activity, so that it would be inferior to our mental activities during the day time when we are exposed to the beneficial influence of outside reality. But are we right in assuming that the influence of reality is exclusively a beneficial one? May it not be that it is also harmful and that, therefore, the absence of its influence tends to bring forth qualities superior to those we have when we are awake?
>
> Symbolic language is the one universal language the human race has developed, the same for all cultures and throughout history. It is a language with its own grammar and syntax, as it were, a language one must understand if one is to understand the meaning of myths, fairy tales and dreams. Yet this language has been forgotten by modern man. Not when he is asleep, but when he is awake. Is it important to understand this language also in our waking state?

The "language of dreams," then, is not a specialized study but a study in occultism. It is said that those who become "adept" in marshaling their own highest powers of perception recognize the continuing necessity of self-transformation.

FROM KRISHNA'S TEACHING

HE, O Arjuna, who by the similitude found in himself seeth but one essence in all things, whether they be evil or good, is considered to be the most excellent devotee. When he realizes perfectly that all things whatsoever are comprehended in the ONE, he attains to the Supreme Spirit. He who seeth the Supreme Being existing alike imperishable in all perishable things, sees indeed. Perceiving the same Lord present in everything and everywhere, he does not by the lower self destroy his own soul, but goeth to the supreme end.

All this universe is pervaded by me in my invisible form; all things exist in me, but I do not exist in them. Understand that all things are in me even as the mighty air which passes everywhere is in space. Those great of soul partaking of the godlike nature, knowing me to be the imperishable principle of all things, worship me, diverted to nothing else. Enveloped by my magic illusion I am not visible to the world; therefore the world does not recognize me the unborn and exhaustless.

The devotee who, striving with all his might, obtaineth perfection because of efforts continued through many births, goeth to the supreme goal. The man who is endued with this devotion and who seeth the unity of all things perceiveth the Supreme Soul in all things and all things in the Supreme Soul. In those for whom the knowledge of the true Self has dispersed ignorance, the Supreme as if lighted by the sun, is revealed. He who being not deluded knoweth me as the Supreme Spirit, knoweth all things and worships me under every form and condition.

He whose actions are for me alone, who esteemeth me the supreme goal, who is my servant only, without attachment to the results of action and free from enmity towards any creature, cometh to me. Those who worship me, renouncing in me all their actions, regarding me as the supreme goal and meditating on me alone, if their thoughts are turned to me, I presently become the savior from this ocean of incarnation and death. Thy mind and Buddhi being

placed on me, thou shalt without doubt come to me. To them thus always devoted to me, who worship me with love, I give that mental devotion by which they come to me.

There dwelleth in the heart of every creature, O Arjuna, the Master—*Ishwara*—who by his magic power causeth all things and creatures to revolve mounted upon the universal wheel of time. Take sanctuary with him alone with all thy soul; by his grace thou shalt obtain supreme happiness, the eternal place. Place thy heart upon me as I have declared myself to be, serve me; offer unto me alone, and bow down before me alone, and thou shalt come to me; I swear it, for thou art dear to me. Forsake every other religion and take refuge alone with me; grieve not, for I shall deliver thee from all transgressions. For those who, thinking of me as identical with all, constantly worship me, I bear the burden of the responsibility of their happiness.

Those who seek this sacred ambrosia—the religion of immortality—even as I have explained it, full of faith, intent on me above all others, and united to devotion, are my most beloved. He also is my beloved who is not afraid and who has no fear of man; who is free from joy, from despondency and the dread of harm. Perform thou that which thou hast to do, at all times unmindful of the event; for the man who doeth that which he hath to do, without attachment to the result, obtaineth the Supreme. The doer who performs necessary actions unattached to their consequences and without love or hatred is of the nature of the quality of truth. The discerning power that knows how to begin and to renounce, what should and what should not be done, what is to be feared and what not, what holds fast and what sets the soul free, is of the quality of truth. Know that the wisdom which perceives in all nature one single principle, indivisible and incorruptible, not separate in the separate objects seen, is of the *sattva* quality.

He who leaves undone what he ought to do shall not obtain the fruit which comes from right forsaking. A man's own natural duty, even though stained with faults, ought not to be abandoned. For all human acts are involved in faults, as the fire in smoke. The true renouncer, full of the quality of goodness, wise and exempt from all doubt, is averse neither to those works which fail nor those which succeed. The man of doubtful mind hath no happiness either in this world or in the next, or in any other.

on the lookout

Background of Psychotherapy

A discussion of Carl Jung's *Memories, Dreams, and Reflections* in the *New Yorker* for May 23, 1964, by Lewis Mumford, supplies what might be called a theosophical perspective on psychoanalysis and depth psychology. Mr. Mumford writes:

> In one respect, unfortunately, Freud's analysis of the psyche was onesided and Jung's was incomplete. Because they derived their most original insights from dealing with mental illness, both men tended to magnify the negative, "sinful," self-absorbed, often self-destructive aspects of the unconscious mind and to forget the important positive functions that it furthers. In a word, they overplayed the role of the disruptive demons and forgot the healing offices of the Nine Muses. Freud made everyone aware of injuries in infancy that might induce permanent morbid effects, but he needed Adler's reminder that defects and weaknesses were often a stimulus to compensatory efforts that more than made good the loss, and the possibility that blessings, reversing traumas, might leave a permanently benign imprint on the personality seems never to have occurred to Freud, though even passing expressions of interest, love, loyalty, and praise (as in Emerson's first talk with Thoreau) may actually keep on reverberating through a lifetime. . . .

The Inner Life

In his last years Jung became increasingly aware of the affirmations and inspirations which can "leave a permanently benign imprint on the personality," and was "amenable to such integrating experiences, especially whenever he found them confirmed by appropriate 'archetypal' dreams." Mr. Mumford continues:

> What both men did was to open the passage for two-way traffic between the inner and the outer world. That all by itself was a lasting contribution. But they necessarily left to others the task of replenishing and fortifying the inner life. Neither stressed sufficiently that the fuller understanding of the dynamic potentialities of the unconscious would bring with it a demand for a firmer discipline and a more sedulous conscious direction, though Freud, in an early paper on psychotherapy, pointed this out when he observed that "it is only by the application of our

highest mental functions, which are bound up with consciousness, that we can control all our impulses."

Mr. Mumford also makes a brief reference to H. P. Blavatsky. In speaking of Jung's dreams and prophesies, he remarks:

> Among the prophetic revelations of his unconscious, by which Jung set great store, was an overpowering vision he had had in October of 1913—the vision of a catastrophic flood sweeping over Europe, with mighty yellow waves full of drowned bodies and the "floating rubble of civilization." This dream, uncanny in retrospect because it was soon verified by events, may be placed in the same category as Mme. Blavatsky's much earlier and even more realistic vision of the destruction of whole cities by nuclear blasts.

Transition in Psychology

Seventy-four years ago, H. P. Blavatsky wrote in her article, "Psychic and Noëtic Action" (now available in the pamphlet *Theosophical Psychology*):

> Memory has no seat, no special organ of its own in the human brain, but it has *seats* in every organ of the body. "No good ground exists for speaking of any special organ, or seat of memory," writes Professor G. T. Ladd. "Every organ indeed, every area, and every limit of the nervous system has its own memory." The seat of memory, then, is assuredly neither here nor there, but everywhere throughout the human body. To locate its organ in the brain is to limit and dwarf the Universal Mind and its countless Rays (the *Manasa putra*) which inform every rational mortal. . . . No Occultist could express [the] teaching more correctly than the Professor, who says: "We might properly speak of the memory of the end-organ of vision or of hearing, of the memory of the spinal cord and of the different so-called 'centres' of reflex action belonging to the chords of the memory of the medulla oblongata, the cerebellum, etc." This is the essence of Occult teaching.

Neurology (1964) Narrows the Gap

H.P.B.'s views and those of George Ladd, professor of philosophy at Yale University, gained little hearing in the scientific circles of their day, but today's researchers apparently are discovering confirmatory evidence. Reporting on a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences held in Washington on April 27th, a staff writer for the New York *Herald Tribune* (April 28, 1964) gives the gist of statements made by Dr. Patrick Wall, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. He writes:

> A man's prejudices may not be stored completely within his brain. They could rest in his eyes, his nose, the sense receptors in his skin or his ears. That could be the reason one baseball umpire will call a pitch a strike and another a ball. . . .The scientists have discovered that chemical changes take place in the nerve endings and all along the nerves right up to the brain. Now they want to find out what effect learning has on those processes outside the brain. Until a relatively few years ago, it was assumed that all learning took place in the cerebral cortex. Now they know this is not so.

The National Academy's symposium aimed at stimulating world-wide interest in how sensory transmissions are sent from a nerve ending to the brain. "This is the biggest gap in man's knowledge," said Dr. Wall. "It's so big, we don't even know how to ask the right questions."

A Man's Word

In a UPI dispatch from Trenton, N.J. (Sept. 16, 1964), note is made of a change in rules of evidence by the New Jersey Supreme Court, which now "permit testimony by atheists and the mentally ill as well as statements by persons now dead." The dispatch adds:

> A person's belief or disbelief in God has no relationship to his credibility as a witness, the court decided yesterday in adopting the new rules. Previously, atheists had been barred by state law from testifying under the theory that an oath to tell the truth would be meaningless to a person who professed no religion.

"The Meaning of a Pledge"

An article of this title printed in *Lucifer* for September, 1888, contains relevant ideas as to the seriousness of a man's oath. The pledge taken by "members of a certain Occult Lodge of the T.S." concludes with the affirmation, "So help me my Higher Self." In amplification of this statement the article notes:

> The term "Higher Self" has recently come into considerable use—at any rate so far as the Theosophical Society is concerned. . . . The "Higher Self" is not a sort of sublimated essence of any one man; a sort of spiritualised "personality." *It* is universal and secondless. . . . The man who takes this Pledge in the right spirit calls upon It, and calls every help and blessing from It to his assistance. By an intense desire to be under Its protection he (though It *per se* is latent and passive) places himself under the protection of the active and beneficent powers that are the direct rays of the Absolute Higher Secondless Self.
>
> But if a man takes this Pledge and betrays his Higher Self, he

> risks every evil and *brings it upon himself*. Thus then, he who remains true to the Pledge has nothing to fear; but he who has no confidence in himself to keep the Pledge when taken, had better leave it and, much more, leave Occultism alone. Breaking this Pledge cannot, then, involve penalty on the "Higher Self," but it can affect the individual man. (THEOSOPHY 42: 53.)

Perhaps some intimation of this aspect of Self motivates the "atheist" in his desire to have his word recognized at its own value, not through fear of a punishment from God if he perjures himself.

Frankenstein and the Machine

In the Summer issue of the *American Scholar* (1964) Dr. Oscar Handlin, of Harvard, gives a brief account of why man's "liberator," the machine, is fast becoming his master:

> The machine, which was a product of science, was also magic, understandable only in terms of *how* it worked, not of why. Hence the lack of comprehension or of control; hence also the mixture of dread and anticipation as in the past.

The "why" is likely to go to the heart of the problem. But unfortunately, while presenting a cursory history of the *effects* of modern industrialism, Dr. Handlin does not solve the mystery of why our modern technological world has come to dominate us. We are left with a Dr. Frankenstein and the monster story—an image forceful enough to carry Dr. Handlin's question "why does the monster [as a machine] become the oppressive master of men? It was not evil to begin with or created out of deliberate malice." The story begins with Frankenstein as "a dedicated young man who seeks knowledge to help mankind":

> He is a scientist who discovers the secret of life through the study of electricity, galvanism and chemistry, and supplies his formula to create a machine-monster.
>
> The monster quickly proves himself superior in power to the man. In the confrontation, the machine gives the orders: "Slave, I before reasoned with you, but you have proved yourself unworthy of my condescension. Remember that I have power. . . . I can make you so wretched that the light of day will be hateful to you. . . . You are my creator, but I am your master:—obey!" It is no coincidence that the machine will seem the master to many men in modern society.
>
> The machine speaks once more: "Once my fancy was soothed with dreams of virtue, of fame and of enjoyment. Once I falsely hoped to meet with beings who pardoning my outward form would love me for the excellent qualities I was capable of un-

> folding. . . . I cannot believe that I am the same creature whose thoughts were once filled with sublime and transcendent visions of the beauty and majesty of goodness. But it is even so; the fallen angel becomes a malignant devil." And it is even so that modern men will continue to think of the machine and of science —potentially good yet capable of perpetrating a frightful catalogue of sins.
>
> The question remains: why this ominous foreboding, which antedated industrialization and was confirmed by it?

Dr. Frankenstein is intensely human. He is the bright young man of twentieth-century science. But some important factor has been left out in his discovery of the "secret of life." Thus the monster whose thoughts were once "sublime and transcendent visions of the beauty and majesty of goodness."

Technology—the Fallen Angel

Students of Theosophy will recognize the parallel between the Frankenstein monster and H. P. Blavatsky's discussion in "The Fall of Ideals" (see the pamphlet, *Moral and Social Issues*) of the Angel of Liberty and the Satanic Protest. H.P.B. tells us that a liberating vision, seen as a white Lotus of thought, may "spring now, as in former ages, from the rottenness of the world of matter, generating Protest and Liberty." She continues:

> It is springing in our very midst and under our very eyes, from the mire of modern civilization, fecund bed of contrasting virtues. . . . In the very depths of the heart of this HUMAN Satanic totality burns the divine spark, all negations notwithstanding. It is called LOVE FOR HUMANITY, an ardent aspiration for a universal reign of justice—hence a latent desire for light, harmony and goodness.

Modern technology, viewed as an extension of man's body, has become as much a part of the Ego's vehicle as is the earth. It is a projection of both higher- and lower-manasic impulses—first as a liberating ideal for the future, followed by the distorted material effects of a "malignant devil," and eventually followed again by voices of protest raised against a loss of spiritual vision during material progress.

Frankenstein and Economics

A translation of "Frankenstein and the Monster" into the symbols of economics results in the generalized criticism presented by Dr. Walter A. Weisskopf of Roosevelt University in a *Manas* article

(Aug. 21, 1963) titled "Economic Growth and Human Well-being":

> Our Economy has become an impersonal master; the slavery imposed by men has been replaced by the slavery imposed by machines and by the organization of labor. There is little pleasure and well-being connected with the work of the great majority of our employees and workers. Its only subjective raison d'etre is the earning of an income and its only rationale is the increase in the GNP [Gross National Product]. This means that the bulk of our waking hours is spent in an activity abhorrent to us and detrimental to our well-being.

Some Effects of Modern Industrial Society

Dr. Weisskopf's comment is familiar, but somehow the terms of economic thought do not move most men to action—we look in vain for an engaging vision of modern technological society. He continues:

> The modern social sciences abound with findings about the bad effects of modern industrial society. It is enough to mention the lack of community and solidarity, the impersonality of human relations, the other-directed conformism of man in the "lonely crowd," the anomie or ruthlessness caused by modern rationalism, the estrangement of modern urban man from nature, his alienation from himself through his subjection to the market, his becoming an annex to the machine, his loss of individuality in the gigantic establishments of production and consumption.
>
> What is important to understand is that modern sociology and social psychology are actually criticizing the detrimental effects of our economic system, regardless of the wealth it has given to the masses.

A Timely Warning Repeated

All Theosophists, aware of the dangers of the upsurge of psychic force in the latter half of a century, tend to note those examples which they consider most dangerous. The lead article in *Sunrise* (published by the Theosophical Press, Altadena, Calif.) quotes verbatim three glaring examples of advertisements aimed at taking advantage of man's desire to gain money, power, and domination over another. The author, Grace F. Knoche, notes that "it is not the out-and-out lie that does the damage; it is the half- and quarter-truths that hold the drawing power." She then goes on to retrace H. P. Blavatsky's efforts to "undergird" the *facts* of spiritualism while attempting to provide a philosophy which would counteract the

psychic momentum. The author continues:

> We badly need today—as did the 19th century—a "sense of history," a perspective that will outdistance that compelled by the single-life theory. We need to view ourselves in cosmic dimension, as pilgrims of the ages, whose cycle of births and deaths is a replica in miniature of the galactic rhythm—"In IT we live and move and have our being." And not least, we need to know we are not alone in having a "noetic" or *spiritual* as well as a "psychical" or *soul* nature. . . .
>
> It was this cosmic dimension—that grand picture of a living universe in which humanity is a participant—that Blavatsky provided with her *restatement* of those fundamental principles of the Wisdom-teaching which "was the universally diffused religion of the ancient and prehistoric world."

The author, urging that we allow psychic development to "take place naturally," concludes with H.P.B.'s warning to the American Theosophists in her "Fourth Message":

> Psychism, with all its allurements and all its dangers, is necessarily developing among you, and you must beware lest the Psychic outruns the Manasic and Spiritual development. Psychic capacities . . . running riot, controlling instead of controlled, using instead of being used, lead the Student into the most dangerous delusions and the certainty of moral destruction. Watch therefore carefully this development, inevitable in your race and evolution-period, so that it may finally work for good and not for evil.

Emphasis on Original Teachings

Der Theosophische Pfad (October-December, 1964, Schwartzwald, Germany) reprints a talk given by Roberto Hack, head of the Italian Section of the T.S., at the 50th General Convention at Perugia, under the title, *Non vi e Religione alla Verita*—"There is No Religion Higher than Truth." Sig. Hack observes:

> Our yearning for truth demands that we admit—not without pain and regret—that in the course of time other ideas have crept into those noble teachings [of Theosophy], diverging far indeed from the original message, thus undermining the foundation of that original impulse, given by the Theosophical Adepts, from within. These high and noble conceptions were watered down, unintentionally perhaps, and grossly misrepresented, thereby losing their original crystalline purity at the expense of the seriousness of the whole undertaking. Add to this today's tendency for blind belief by the majority of men and the preference for form and ceremony of diverse kinds taking the place of free,

courageous and independent inquiry; and lastly the unconscious tendency toward something, justly defined today as "Personality Cult," and the door was opened for those tendencies toward authority, credulity and blind belief in our Society that would gradually replace the original conceptions.

Besides, we have been convinced by direct evidence that many of the misrepresentations and inconsistencies appearing in the T.S. in the course of time were due to incomplete knowledge, if not complete ignorance regarding the original Theosophical teachings, or else that these just were forgotten.

Revaluation

Sig. Hack then states that such symptoms of awakening have been evident for the last two years in many parts of the Theosophical Movement, the most recent and internationally effective indication being the publication of E. L. Gardner's pamphlet *There is no Religion Higher than Truth.* Sig. Hack suggests:

[The reaction to this pamphlet was due] to the author's practical and courageous statements concerning that which should be the duty of every Theosophist, namely, the testing, without fear or prejudice, of the "teachings" that have come down to us from our past and present leaders, with the utmost objectivity and absence of all possible partiality. . . . We rest on the conviction that principles are by far more important than personalities.

Sig. Hack then goes on to say that there must be no dogmas. The student must see everything offered for his consideration in the right perspective, give it the right evaluation, erect no idols nor replace one idol with another; in short, remain free from the influence of leaders. Students must be given as much opportunity as possible to acquaint themselves with the actual, original teachings of Theosophy, so as to enable each one to use his own discrimination when confronted with other and possibly erroneous writings.

He ends with H.P.B.'s warning not to accept her message blindly; her admonition that the Movement needs serious students, not acquiescent believers.

On Prayer in the Schools

An article on this subject in *Manas* (Nov. 18, 1964, p. 5) draws attention to the great amount of discussion which goes on in Congressional committee hearings concerned with such issues. For example, the debate before the Committee of the Judiciary on Prayer in the Public Schools began on April 22 and continued until June 3,

1964, amassing material for three volumes totaling 2774 pages. Some of the oratory is, of course, flamboyant and emotional; but much is clear, rational, and judicial. The following paragraphs, emphasizing judicial aspects of the controversy, are taken from an address by Walter E. Craig, president of the American Bar Association, titled "The Supreme Court of the United States—A Look at Its Critics":

> The most surprising feature of *Engel,* the school prayer case, is the degree of surprise and interest it evoked in the public press and from legal scholars. It is difficult to dispute the fact that *Engel* was clearly predictable from prior opinions of the Court, and no other decision would have been consistent with the dictates of the first amendment. . . .
>
> The Court characterized the prayer as a State-sponsored "religious activity" which is exactly what the first amendment was intended to prohibit. The Court made quite clear that its opinion was not hostile to religion, but rather was in favor of religion. The Court pointed out that State-sponsored secular studies about religion were not invalid under the decision. It is also undoubtedly true that a watered-down, common-denominator version of religion, designed to encompass all religions and offend none, does more to injure religion than to further it. This is a particular drawback in the regents' prayer which the public should have considered.
>
> More important, however, is the Court's attitude toward any type of religious prayer sponsored by the State. This became apparent in subsequent cases of *Murray v. Curlett* and *School District v. Schempp,* where the Court invalidated the use in school classrooms of a State-sponsored prayer consisting of extracts from the Bible itself. . . .
>
> When time gives the opportunity for thoughtful evaluation rather than emotional reaction, *Engel, Schempp,* and *Murray* may come to be recognized as bulwarks of America's freedom from the ills that continue to plague those countries where "toleration" rather than "freedom" and "separation" are the guides to government action.

The *Manas* article referred to makes the point that "it has become increasingly clear that politics and religion not only need to be discussed a good deal more, but ought to be examined together."